REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-referenced application in light of the amendments above and remarks that follow.

In the Office Action, claim 7, 8, 10-14, 16-21, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Underwood. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Underwood in view of Swift. In response to the Office Action, the independent claims have been amended and new claims 29-32 have been added.

Specifically, all of the claims except claim 9 are rejected as being anticipated by Underwood. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Underwood, although directed to the construction and editing of websites at a remote server, suffers from the same shortcomings as the prior art cited against this application and overcome by previous amendments. It does not provide the indicator to the user of the current hierarchal level while the user is administering at that level.

Turning to claim 7, as currently amended, it is directed to a method for administering a plurality of websites having an indicator which makes it possible for administrators and users at a variety of hierarchal levels to more efficiently and more easily administer the website. Claim 7 has been amended to further emphasize some of the arguments made previously in that the method provides an indicator to the user of the hierarchal level at which the user has accessed the website and in effect is administering the website while the user is administering the plurality of websites. In other words, there is real time feedback to the user reminding the user at which level they are currently processing.

Although this feature may not come into play at the website user level, the WHITE level in the example provided in the specification, it does come into play at the higher levels, such as RED and BLACK, and even BLUE and GREEN in which the administration of the website may include administering at a level which requires less

than all of the rights to which the user is entitled. Therefore, while administrating, the indicator is always present. By way of non-limiting example, the screen has an overall green hue to it while accessing at the GREEN level to remind the user of the level at which they are administrating even if their overall position in the hierarchy is at a much higher level. If the user is entitled, and then wishes to administer at the RED level, which is then the address corresponding to the level at which the website is accessed, the screen will take a different indicator while the user is administrating.

This is a feature still not taught or even suggested by Underwood.

The Office Action considers Col. 12, lines 42-65 as well as Col. 8, lines 59-67 to teach that there is an indicator to the user of the hierarchal level at which they have accessed the website. However, Underwood is directed to the ability of a user to build a website hosted on a remote server. Underwood provides an indicator before the fact through the use of its icons as shown in Fig. 5. In other words, the user selects the tool the user wishes to use, but once the tool is selected, there is no further discussion of indicating to the user where that user is in a hierarchy of rights. Therefore, a user very high up in hierarchy if performing tasks lower in the hierarchy to observe the operation of the website at that level may lose track of where they are in the overall management and administration of the website.

Col. 8, relied upon by the Office Action, is not a true indicator to the user of their spot in the hierarchy, but rather is a recognition of the functionality to be presented to an individual user as a function of the capabilities of the computer the user is utilizing, or some other recognition. In other words, different icons may be presented because that user expects to be at an accounting website, or at a calendar website, or at a general information website. This goes to formatting the created website in a manner that the user is accustomed or is able to handle. It is equivalent to a "saved your personal settings" feature in Microsoft Word® products.

By way of example, the accounting personnel who log on may be presented only with the relevant accounting data in a format to which they are accustomed. This

321214_1.DOC

is a feature comparable to a "my settings" feature for cell phones or wallpaper or the like in which the website created in accordance with the invention will remember the personal setting of a user. It is not an indication of where in the hierarchy of administrating a website the user is operating as in the claimed invention. This is further pointed out by the fact that recognizing a user and their settings may equally be a function of recognizing the user or the capabilities of the device used to access the website. In other words, if the system recognizes that the user continually accesses from a Blackberry® type device, the system will remember the settings of that user to enable the limited access a Blackberry® can support. This is not akin to providing an indicator at the website corresponding to the level of administration being utilized by the user.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The flexibility of the current invention as opposed to Underwood is further evidenced by newly added claim 29. Claim 29 defines the scope of the hierarch as compared to the prior art. First, Applicants submit that there is no real hierarchy in Underwood as the term hierarchy is taught in the present invention. There are different functionalities provided by the different definers, but these are the actual tools for creating the website.

On the other hand, the claimed use of the indicator to the user while the user is administrating a plurality of websites, enables the interrelation of a hierarchy of users spanning the gamut from the website user up through the administrator of the hosting server up to the entity which administers the software at the hosting server to enable the administration of the plurality of websites at the at least one server. By way of example, all of the activity in Underwood occurs at the white, blue, and green levels of the hierarchy described in the instant invention. It is the basic methodology of claim 7 which can support the expanded hierarchy defined in claim 29.

321214_1.DOC

Claims 8 and 10 depend from claim 7 and define the novel invention with greater particularity. Specifically, claim 8 defines the indicator as the preferred embodiment which is a graphical indicator while claim 10 allows the user to enter the website at a different hierarchal level than that stored at the server, and provide a second indicator corresponding to the hierarchal level of the user corresponding to the current level at which the website has been accessed; again in real time while the user is administrating the plurality of websites.

The Office Action relies on Col. 8 of Underwood to teach allowing the user to enter the website at a different hierarchal level than that stored at the server and providing a second indicator. However, Col. 8 merely defines the ability of the website to provide the necessary template to the anticipated customer as a function of how the end user website is accessed. It teaches, by way of example, that a potential customer enters the website in one manner and accesses the informational information while a warehousing user with accesses the running inventory list while other users have access to the maintained data. However, there is nothing that teaches that any of these users has the ability to administer or edit the website or enter at other levels. Therefore, there would be no need for any type of indicator indicating to the user the current level of access. Providing a desired format to facilitate use by an end user who may be oblivious, as an end user, as to any type of hierarchy at all is not the same as providing an indicator to a website administrator to indicate the current hierarchal entry level to the website being administered. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection and submits that claims 8 and 10 are allowable as defining patentable combinations in their own right as well as depending from allowable claim 7.

For similar reasons, claims 11 and 26 are allowable over Underwood. Both claims 11 and 26 have been amended to emphasize that the indicator is provided to the user while the user is performing administration of the website. This is much different than the Underwood use of icons, which tell a person in advance the function they are performing, not their place in the hierarchy while actually performing the function.

321214_1.DOC

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11 and 26 are allowable and request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claims 12-14, 16-21 depend from claim 17 and define the invention with greater particularity.

Claims 12 and 27 define the steps of grouping all users with common access rights into a plurality of respective groups, storing the groups at the server, determining to which group the user belongs, and enabling the access rights for the user based on the rights granted to the group to which the user belongs. There is no teaching in Underwood of such a group. The Office Action relies upon Col. 12, lines 56-65 and Col. 29, lines 44-48 as teaching the grouping of like access rights of individuals. However, the specific teaching of Cols. 12 and 29 is that if a user has previously registered, then the client terminal is directed to a web page having services and links designed for the **existing user** (emphasis added). There is no teaching or mention of groups.

Similarly, claim 17 defines grouping the users with common access rights, determining to which group the user belongs and segregating the rights based upon the rights associated with the specific group to which the user is a member. There is no teaching of any group logic or group processing in Underwood. Underwood specifically teaches that any aggregation of rights and accesses is done on a user-by-user level.

Claim 13 defines the step of determining the hierarchal level of the user. Again, reference is made to Col. 12 and 29 for such a teaching in Underwood. However, Underwood does not indicate where the user is in the hierarchy, rather that the user will always be directed to their personal web page. This is merely the mapping of rights or previously recorded preferences, on an individual basis, to an access code, not a determination of where in an administrative hierarch the user belongs.

Claim 20 again affirmatively recites determining a hierarchal level of the user as a function of the rights of a user. Underwood merely teaches determining the rights of the user, never a level within a hierarchy. Underwood is silent as to this functionality.

321214_1.DOC

Applicants cannot find the teaching relied upon in the Office Action that an administrative user enters the site as a potential user to provide a second indicator corresponding to the hierarchal administrative level of the user corresponding to the level at which the user has accessed the website.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 12-14 and 16-21 are allowable as defining patentable combinations in their own right as well as depending from allowable claim 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claim 27, depends from claim 26, and like claim 12, defines the format of the storage of the access right information in the system. As discussed above, there is no teaching of such grouping and storage in Underwood and Applicants respectfully the withdrawal of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Underwood in view of Swift. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Swift is considered to teach a method of restricting access based on hierarchal levels where color is used as a graphical indicator to display the access level. However, nothing in Swift overcomes the shortcomings of Underwood. Swift is directed to a binary system, which allows access, or not to privileged and non-privileged portions. Swift provides access to different pages or areas within a single website. The indicator in Swift is on a task-by-task basis and is not an indicator of where in the hierarchy the user is currently operating. Accordingly, a key limitation missing from Underwood as discussed above is not taught by Swift and therefore, even if combined, does not teach the novel methodology of claim 9 which is providing the color to the user, while the user is administrating the plurality of web sites, of the hierarchal level at which the user has accessed the website. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the above-referenced application in condition for allowance. If the Examiner is unable to issue an immediate

321214_1.DOC

Notice of Allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney with a view towards discussing the outstanding issues.

Dated: <u>January 31, 2007</u>   Respectfully submitted,

                                              By

Howard M. Gitten
   Registration No.: 32,138
EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE
   LLP
350 East Las Olas Boulevard
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301
(954) 727-2600
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

321214_1.DOC